Local Boundary Commission

From: "Senator Gary Wilken" <Senator_Gary_Wilken@legis.state.ak.us>
To: "Al" <alnear@alaska.net>
Cc: <LBC@dced.state.ak.us>; "Ralph Seekins" <Senator_Ralph_Seekins@legis.state.ak.us>; "Del Ackels" <golddustmines@gci.net>; "Tom & Diana Miller" <aktrmiller@gci.net>; <farnham@gci.net>; "Senator Gene Therriault" <Senator_Gene_Therriault@legis.state.ak.us>; "Sheila Peterson" <Sheila_Peterson@legis.state.ak.us>
Sent: Friday, February 07, 2003 7:47 AM
Subject: Re: Unorganized Borough Review

Good morning Al,

Thanks again for your notes.

Your concerns are valid and I appreciate Mr. Bockhorst's explanation. The important thing to remember is, that if a certain area of our state today has the capacity to support local government, the method by which that may happen is the process set forth in our Constitution, statues, and regulations. During that process, the method by which the local government (be it a minimalist government or one with full blown powers - and I would suspect the former) is funded is a major part of the consideration. As Mr. Bockhorst suggested, the funding of the government may rely on a property tax, but maybe not.   I would suggest that the area about which you are concerned, given its large non-taxable (federal) areas measured against the 4 mill education requirement, may well be funded by a sales tax or even a seasonal sales tax. Perhaps even an employment or head tax, seasonal or year around.

But that is the discussion that will take place should a petition or legislation be moved forward.

This issue is not about penalizing Alaskans like you that are already carrying your fair share, it is about those that hide from government, surfacing with their hands extended palm up only when they need their next monetary fix to continue their programs which are funded, in part, by the hard working Fairbanksans I represent.

The people I represent go to work every day and pay their fair share for services rendered. I expect, and will continue to expect, those that have the capacity to do the same, but do not today because they "don't want more government", step up to the plate. They should be asked and expected to shoulder their share of their responsibility, not just for the sake of "government" but for cause of "good government."

I simply ask that they carry their fair share. And why not, you are.

Please stay in touch and I will work on your concerns.

Thank you

Gary Wilken

Al wrote:

> Dear LBC: Regarding the creation of new boroughs in the regions of
> review, the potential for taxation of recreational property is of

concern to me. Many seasonal users within these review areas actually reside within one of the organized boroughs. They only visit their remote parcels a few times a year for recreational purposes. Many are situated in such remote locations that access is limited to aircraft or ATV. Not only are these owners present for just a few days each summer season, their land use imposes virtually no cost to the region. They have no children attending schools there, no roads connect to their parcels, no utilities are available... In short, there are no services available now, nor would there be after the creation of a local government. And yet, there appears to be a high likelihood that a property tax would be imposed! Most owners already pay property tax in their home boroughs. So, they could end up paying tax for education and other services to both regions, but only receiving benefits in one. I have no problem with the concept of universal education and have willingly supported it in the Fairbanks North Star Borough before, during and after the period when my kids attended public schools. But, to contribute both here and to some other jurisdiction that I only visit periodically and from which I can never enjoy any services is preposterous. Given that the stated objective of creating new boroughs is to *more fairly* spread the cost of education among all residents of Alaska, I find this particular aspect very disturbing. Yours truly, Al Near